



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,498	10/21/1999	C. DAVID YOUNG	98CR095/KE	5622

7590 05/22/2003

ROCKWELL COLLINS INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
M/S 124-323
400 COLLINS ROAD NE
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52498

EXAMINER

HYUN, SOON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2663

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/422,498

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Soon-Dong Hyun

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 0203.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10 and 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-10,12-16,18,19,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,17 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2663

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rautanen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,605)

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 21, and 22, Rautanen et al discloses a method and system for managing communication resources between nodes of a network, involving both dynamic and static assignment of communication time slots, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2663

establishing a network comprising a plurality of dynamic nodes (BTS 1-4 in FIG. 4), network communication being accomplished via assignment of time slots of a time multiplex structure (FIG. 7a), said plurality of dynamic nodes participating in a dynamic assignment protocol (col. 7, lines 45-58), each of said plurality of dynamic nodes being capable of assigning itself a time slot from available time slots of said time multiplex structure, said network further comprising at least one static node not participating in the dynamic assignment protocol (col. 7, lines 45-58); and

pre-assigning a time slot in said time multiplex structure to said at least one static node (col. 7, lines 45-58).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Rautanen et al further discloses that each time slot has a same duration (a unifying slot assignment).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

Art Unit: 2663

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rautanen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,605).

Regarding claims 8 and 15, refer to the discussion for the claims 1 and 10 above.

However, Rautanen et al does not explicitly teach that the network is performed by TDMA/FDM. Those of skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate a TDMA/FDM protocol to increase a capacity. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a TDMA/FDM protocol into Rautanen et al to increase a capacity of communication network.

Regarding claim 16, Rautanen et al does not explicitly teach that a dynamic node has a pre-assigned broadcast time slot in a frame. Those of skill in the art would have been motivated to have a broadcast time slot in each frame to transmit common control information for dynamic nodes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a preassigned broadcast time slot in a frame.

Art Unit: 2663

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 17 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Soon-Dong Hyun whose telephone number is (703) 305-4550. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen, can be reached on (703) 308-5340.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9314 for formal communications intended for entry with a label of

“OFFICIAL” and for informal or draft communications with a label of “PROPOSED” or

“DRAFT” (attn: Art Unit 2663, Soon-Dong Hun.).

g

S. Hun.
05/16/2003

Chau T. Nguyen

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600